

**WOMEN'S UNDERSTANDING OF CONSUMPTION NEEDS
AND CONSUMER GOODS BY THE DEGREE OF URBANIZATION**

by

Hulya Yuksel

B.A., Aegean University, Izmir, Turkey, 1990

M.A., Aegean University, Izmir, Turkey, 1994

**A thesis submitted to the
University of Colorado at Denver
in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
Sociology
1998**



This Thesis for the Master of Arts

degree by

Hülya Yüksel

has been approved

by


Candan Duran-Aydintug


Kjell Törnblom


Karl Flaming


Richard Anderson

12/14/98
Date

Yuksel, Hulya (M.A, Sociology)

Women's Understanding of Consumption Needs and Consumer Goods by the Degree of Urbanization

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Candan Duran Aydintug

ABSTRACT

In this study, the consumer behavior of women who were defined as housewives was examined on the basis of their consumption needs and attitudes toward consumer goods. The data necessary for testing the hypotheses on consumer behavior were gathered from three different neighborhoods which revealed different cultural, demographic, and sociological characteristics. All together three hundred women were chosen from the three areas In Izmir, Turkey, in a sample.

The core of the analyses were based on hypotheses that stated relationships between urban setting and duration of urban residency on the one hand, and the level of education, age, income, and consumer behavior on the other. The causal relationships among these variables were demonstrated using various statistical research techniques.

This abstract accurately represents the content of the candidate's thesis. I recommend its publication.

Signed



Candan Duran Aydintug

CONTENTS

Chapter

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Review of the Literature: Urban, Urbanization, Urbanization of Individuals	9
2.1	The Description of Cities	9
2.2	Urbanization Process	10
2.2.1	Urbanization of Individuals	15
2.3	Gecekondu (Squatter) in the Process of Urbanization	18
2.4	Research Question and Hypotheses	23
3.	Methods.....	26
3.1	Description of Research Area	26
3.2	Characteristics of Women in Three Neighborhoods	29
3.3	Sampling	30
3.4	Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristic of Women.....	31
3.4.1	Women's Place of Birth by Neighborhood	31
3.4.2	Women's Age Distribution by Neighborhood	32
3.4.3	Women's Level of Education by Neighborhood	33
3.4.4	Length of Time Women Spent in the Urban Area.....	34
3.4.5	Place of Residence Prior to Moving to Izmir by Neighborhood.....	35
3.4.6	Husbands' Occupations by Neighborhood	35

3.4.7	Average Monthly Income by Neighborhood	37
3.4.8	Family Composition by Neighborhood	37
4.	Results & Discussion: Women's Understanding of Needs and Goods.....	41
4.1	Women's Possessions by Neighborhood	44
4.2	Women's Perception of Needs by Neighborhood.....	46
4.3	Understanding of Goods among Women.....	52
4.3.1	Women's Perception of the Relationship between Social Status and Goods	56
4.3.2	Understanding of "Brand Name" among Women.....	59
4.3.2.1	How Much Importance Women Give to Brand Name.....	60
4.4	Women's Perception of their Socioeconomic Status.....	62
5.	Conclusion	66
	Appendix.....	71
A.	Questionnaire Form.....	71
B.	Response From Research Area.....	76
	Bibliography	78

Tables

3.1	Women's Place of Birth by Neighborhood	32
3.2	Women's Age Distribution by Neighborhood	33
3.3	Level of Education by Neighborhood.....	34
3.4	Length of Time That Women Spent Urban Area by Neighborhood	34
3.5	Place of Residence Prior to Moving to Izmir by Neighborhood.....	35
3.6	Husband's Occupation by Neighborhood.....	36
3.7	Average Monthly Income by Neighborhood	37
3.8	Family Composition by Neighborhood	37
4.1	Women's Possessions by Neighborhood	45
4.2	Understanding of Needs by Neighborhood.....	47
4.3	Do Women Think They Have Enough Goods?	48
4.4	Satisfaction with Living Standards by Neighborhood.....	49
4.5	Classification of Some Durable Goods on a Necessity and Luxury Basis by Neighborhoods	51
4.6	How Women Perceive Goods by Neighborhood	54
4.7	Desired Characteristics of Goods by Neighborhood	55
4.8	Perceived Relationship between Goods and Status by Neighborhood	57

4.9 Perceived Prestige Measured by Owning of Goods by Neighborhood	58
4.10 Understanding of Quality by Neighborhood	59
4.11 Importance of Brand by Neighborhood.....	61
4.12 How Women Perceive Their Socio-Economic Status	62

Chapter 1

1. Introduction

Despite its significance in the social world, the issue of consumption is one of the neglected phenomena in sociology, and has failed to capture the attention of mainstream theoretical frameworks (Nicosia and Mayer, 1976). Most attention paid to the consumption is from economists and marketers. They study the consumer as a client, buyer, and consuming unit, and they try to predict the needs of consumers and their buying behavior to be able to arrange the market. They see consumption as a function of income. Most economists recognize two kinds of needs, psychological and physical, but they give priority to the physical. Economists treat it as a necessity, while they downgrade the other demands to a class of artificial wants, false, luxurious, even immoral (Douglas and Isherwood, 1996). On the other hand, Baudrillard (1988: 36) defines the approach of a sociologist as follows: “Sociologists allow for a ‘social-dynamics’ of needs. They activate models of conformity and competition (“keeping up with the Joneses”) derived from the pressure of peer group, or they elaborate grand ‘cultural models’ which are related to society in general or to history.”

In this study, consumerism is viewed as a social phenomenon rather than simply an economic one. Attention is given to the process and meanings of consumption practices. Leinwand (1970:3) proposes that “consumption, in late twentieth-century Western forms of capitalism, may be seen, therefore, as a social and cultural process involving cultural signs and symbols, not simply as an economic utilitarian process.” As it is mentioned above, in contrast to economics, in this research consumption is viewed as a way of fulfilling needs while reflecting the value systems. Baudrillard (1988: 37) argues, “needs are not so much directed at objects, but at values. And satisfaction of needs primarily expresses an *adherence to these values*.” Consumer behavior results from the interaction of different social factors, such as consumer’s family, reference groups, social status and culture. Therefore, studying consumer behavior is very complex. Baudrillard (1988:10-56) also states that consumption is based “upon desires, not simply upon need.”

Everybody has to consume in order to satisfy basic needs, -- as housing, clothing, and food--, to live. Studying consumer behavior using the tools of sociology should give insight into the underlying motives for the obvious patterns of consumer behavior. This has implications for society. For example, a manufacturer of consumer goods may exploit a group of consumers by appealing to their emotions with no regard for the health consequences. After reevaluation of industrialization, technocrats have molded patent solutions to

basic human needs and converted us to the belief that human needs were shaped by nature as demands for the products that we have invented. We have embodied our worldview into our institutions and we are now their prisoners. Factories, news media, governments, and schools produce goods and services packaged to contain our view of the world. In modern industrial societies everybody has freedom of choice in consumption- that fake freedom to be the king in the supermarket (Fromm, 1968). Leinwand (1970:16) defines this thought similarly:

To say that the consumer is king because he has a choice of soaps or that his decision determines the kind of soap manufacturers will make is nonsense. If it is true that knowledge is power, then “king consumer” is powerless indeed. For the most part, the consumer is ignorant of how things are made and of what to look for when he shops.

Thorstein Veblen’s (1899) theory of conspicuous consumption provides the important insight that people consume goods for reasons that go far beyond their use value. He also points out that patterns of consumption within a socio-cultural group are related to the social position and aspirations of the group. The significance of the consumption pattern of a particular group can be understood by comparing its consumer behavior with that of its reference groups. Consumption is not only a function of income. Conspicuous consumption is a significant status symbol; it helps an individual move to a higher status. In other words, individuals’ consumption patterns are determined by the group to which they belong and their reference group, which may be the

same group or two different groups. So it is expected that women's understanding of consumption needs will be determined by their own group as well as and their reference group. "During the process of consumption, [a] human being not only satisfies material needs, but also make sense of her/his everyday world through symbols, in order to interpret the world, [and] compares the meanings he/she developed with others who share the same life-world" (Suerdem, 1994: 424).

It is well-known fact that consumers may buy a given product for reasons other than the product's basic functional performance. People are often motivated to buy a good or service on the basis of what it represents to them, and to others with whom they associate, or to some social referent (Leigh, 1992; Douglas and Isherwood, 1979; Veblen, 1899; Goffman, 1951)

The symbolic interactionist perspective holds that consumers are strongly influenced by their interaction with society or significant reference groups. After the consumer chooses to identify with a particular group, he/she must determine exactly what certain products mean to group members. If the consumer finds that symbolism is important, he/she will tend to behave in the manner perceived as being favorable in the eyes of the relevant group referents. In this process of symbolic meaning transfer, the group is assumed to publicly convey the symbols attached to products and then demonstrate the relative importance of these symbols to present and prospective group member. The group then observes the

behavior of these real or aspirational group members and applies rewards or sanctions based on the level of adoption of the product symbolism (Holt, 1997).

Bourdieu (1984) argues that in modern societies, consumption is a relatively autonomous institution in which people's actions are structured by cultural frameworks of tastes (Holt, 1997: 330). Bourdieu aimed to combine the concept of social status, and the use that status groups make of specific patterns of consumption as a way of distinguishing one way of life from another. In his view, that consumption involves signs, symbols, ideas, and values (cited in Bocock, 1993: 64). Consumption can be seen as a set of social and cultural practices that serve as a way of establishing differences between social groups.

In addition to the inherent utility of goods, consumption also involves goods being purchased for their symbolic value and their meaning to the consumer (e.g. people who buy cars pay attention to the image a particular car can create). As Judith Williamson (1986: 230) has said: "The conscious chosen meaning in most people's lives comes much more from what they consume than what they produce." Consumer goods have become a crucial area for the construction of meanings, identities, and gender roles, in postmodern capitalism. John Fiske (1989: 31) has argued that: " commodities are not just objects of economic exchange; they are goods to think with, goods to speak with." His hypothesis seems to be eloquently illustrated by the behavior of rural people who migrate to urban areas.

The movement to urban areas has been a prominent and persistent trend in the changing distribution of the Turkish population much like other developing countries. The “pull” effect of the cities combined with “push” effects of the rural areas has facilitated extensive migration. In this respect, higher income, better living standards, more access to public services are among the main attractions of the cities. Despite some narrowing of rural-urban income differences in recent years, disparities still remain significantly high. As a result, low-income migrant dwellers in the cities tend to have typically higher income than most villagers in the rural areas. In addition, when public services are taken into account, urban-rural differences are magnified. For instance, education, health, and transport services are much poorer in the countryside. All these factors combined have rendered migration into the cities a viable alternative for many rural families.

Migration from rural areas to urban areas resulted in the rapid growth of Turkish cities. People from different social backgrounds began to reside in the same city. However, newcomers brought their rural culture to the city, living in the peripheries of the city without integrating into the urban lifestyle. Generally, the *gecekondu* residents (i.e. squatter settlements in big cities) display different aspects of urban-oriented behavior, while retaining certain village customs and practices. The *gecekondu* is generally defined as “the dwelling unit on somebody

else's site that was built in a way which is not approved by the general legal provisions for buildings and construction (Kongar, 1976: 205)."

Consumption cultures are now global. Like the "gecekondu," which are migrant residencies in urban areas, developing countries such as Turkey try to imitate the Western countries' patterns of consumption. They often do this even when it undermines their traditional culture and contributes little in the way of real modernization, such as improvements in education, general health and well-being.

The intent of the research reported here is to investigate the understanding of consumption needs and goods by comparing a group of identified urbanized women with semi-gecekondu and gecekondu women. Specifically, the three groups will be compared on their consumption patterns and on their lifestyle. As Mill (1997:54) states that "Migrants' consumption is not simply a reflection of material interests or economic need but is also cultural process." The underlined purpose of this study is to test how well level of urbanism predicts attitudinal and behavioral differences compared to other important sociological variables.

In this research, the analysis of the "urbanization of individuals," gecekondu phenomenon will be framed by a critique of modernization theory. A method section that will describe the research area, sampling, and demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of women will follow the chapter. In the

following chapter, the relationship between consumption behaviors and the urbanization level of women in Turkey will be described. And this will provide the superstructure and historical context for this community-level analysis. Women from three different areas of the same city will be analyzed in terms of how they think about needs and goods, what meaning they attribute to goods, their views on the relationship between goods and social status and how this affects their self-image, how they view brand name and quality.

The data for my research come from questionnaires that I conducted from 300 women in Izmir, Turkey in 1993. In this research only married women will be studied. Questions in the survey provide measures of demographic characteristics of women and their perception of consumption needs and goods.

Chapter 2

2. Review of the Literature: Urban, Urbanization, and “Urbanization of Individuals”

2.1 The Description of Cities

Cities are established to accomplish certain functions. Historically, cities carried out two functions: administration and trade. Both functions require a center for complex activities. This complexity is the first characterization of cities. Complexity reinforces the effect of numbers in diversifying people and their activities, which increases complexity of the social structure. The city is the center of the accumulation of wealth and prosperity. At the same time, cities are the center of new ideas and they are more open to change than rural areas (Ginsburg, 1967). Therefore, the urban area is a type of settlement where the center of production, distribution, and the control of nonagricultural functions is located (Suher, 1991, Wirth, 1938). Kiray (1972) similarly describes the urban environment as a center of nonagricultural production and the transportation of commodities (both agricultural and industrial); it consists of technological developments, heterogeneity, and integration. Wirth (1938) proposes that it is difficult to defend the census definition of city, which designates a community of 2,500 and above as urban and all others as rural. He defines city as a relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of heterogeneous individuals. The

Turkish census bureau describes a city as 10,000 people living within the border of a municipality (Suher, 1991).

According to Gordon Childe (1981), cities have a central role in the rise of civilization. He defines the important characteristics of cities as follows: full-time workers, density of population, scientific research, taxation system for surplus, export system, and social class. Sorokin and Zimmerman categorize eight measurements to define differences between rural and urban areas: occupation, environment, size of society, density of population, heterogeneity and homogeneity of population, social differentiation and stratification, mobility, and interaction system (Tatlidil, 1989).

Park (1952) describes urbanization as a way of life that involves a higher degree of heterogeneity of population, role differentiation, anonymity, isolation, formal relationships, lack of direct social control, temporary social connections, weak family connections, competition among individuals, and a transition from informal relationships to formal ones. Keles describes the urban area as consisting of continuing social development, long-term settlement, professional jobs, entertainment, less agriculture than rural areas, and higher density compared to villages.

2.2 Urbanization Process

Urbanization, in the narrow sense, refers to both the increasing numbers of cities and the increasing numbers of people in cities. However, urbanization

cannot be viewed only as a movement of population. The urbanization process is closely related to changes in the economy and the social structure. Thus, the definition of urbanization requires taking economic and social changes into account (Keles, 1978). Urbanization affects the structure of society; it brings a higher level of organizational development, division of labor, and specialization of occupations. It changes human behavior and human relations (Keles, 1976).

The economic factor, that is, changing the mode of production, has a special weight. Urbanization can be described as the transformation from agriculture to a higher level of production. As a result of this transformation, cities grow and become denser and more heterogeneous. Every country can be measured by this process as more or less urbanized (Keles, 1976). Bendix (1967) posits that societies can be classified according to the degree, to which they exhibit one set of attributes rather than another, resulting in a rank ordering of countries in terms of their relative modernization. Urbanization can also be described as the process by which an individual makes use of the urban structure and becomes part of civic organizations (Senyapili, 1982).

Irmak's (1982) description of urbanization includes five elements: (1) a demographic fact that includes the accumulating and concentrating of population; (2) the transition of population from agriculture to industry and services; (3) the alteration of the physical environment and living conditions; (4) social change and the formation of relations and new composition process; and

(5) the administrative organization process. Thus, urbanization includes the established settlement, increase in number and density of population, local administration, social stratification, industrialization and differentiation of production, and specialization, which result in socioeconomic and cultural alterations (Suher, 1991).

Urbanization is the result of industrialization. However, there is not only one typology of the urbanization process. As listed above, there are some common characteristics of urbanization experiences. Every country has its own variation on this common theme of urbanization (Wirth, 1938). In modernization theory there is a tendency to see the traditional and modern society as polar opposites. The problem with such a characterization is the tendency to reinforce stereotypical and over generalized assumptions of earlier studies. These studies have been dominated by a Western conceptual framework and dichotomous models such as traditional versus modern, patriarchal versus egalitarian, and extended versus nuclear (Kandas, 1992). One argument within this framework is that as “traditional rural society” makes the transition to “urban industrial society,” the extended family gives way to the nuclear family. The structural-functional approach assumes that there is a universal evolutionary path in the transition from the extended to the nuclear family, which is supposed to have originated with industrialization and urbanization. The major challenge to such approaches has come from both empirical data and

historical perspectives that criticize the tendency to de-historicize household formation and create abstract, sterile categories for the family (Kandas, 1992).

Modernization, urbanization and the industrialization process are closely tied together (Ginsburg, 1967). However, urbanization is not parallel to industrialization in developing countries. Although there are some similarities among countries' experiences, there are historical differences, e.g., the point at which urbanization began. Many developing countries that are currently at the early stage of industrial urbanization do not necessarily undergo a Western European style of urbanization.

In addition, developing countries' cities are under the pressure of migration from rural areas. Migration is a result of the attractiveness of high living standards in the city. This migration results in a surplus labor force. Developing countries do not have the capacity to absorb this population in their cities and to turn the new urbanites into productive individuals for the national economy. Thus, many of the migrants are unemployed or working in the “unorganized” (often referred to as marginal or informal) sectors so they can remain in urban areas and try to take advantage of their opportunities and services. Senyapili (1981: 74) describes the unorganized sector as follows:

The “unorganized” sector of the urban economy is characterized by almost unrestricted opportunities for entry due to the prevalence of employment and absence of mechanisms that discourage new entries. Lack of standardization among jobs also distinguishes it from the “organized sector”. The “unorganized sector also acts like a residual

employer as apparent from the very high percentage of the labor force consisting of women, children and young adults.

Nevertheless in developing countries cities are not well developed in terms of mass communication. In sum, the concentration of people in one place does not mean that it is composed of “urbanites.” The cities of developing countries are less effective in functioning as modernization mediators than the Western cities, and experience slower economic growth and industrialization than in Western cities. For these reasons developing countries’ cities do not simulate Westernized cities. On the other hand, these cities are rapidly transforming technologically in terms of public health, transportation, and rationalization of organization (Ginsburg, 1967).

The relationship between industrialization and urbanization is stronger in developed countries than in developing countries. Whereas the urbanization process is seen as a function of industrialization for developed countries, there is not such a connection for developing countries (Kongar, 1982). The peculiarity of urban settings is best summarized in Tilly’s (1968: 93) explanation:

Among other regularities in industrial urbanization, however, the ‘industrial’ is probably more important than the ‘urbanization.’ As the process moves on, the division of labor becomes more complex, specialist in coordination, communication, and control more abundant, formal organization more prominent, the use of city’s space more differentiated, the rhythm of mobility more frenzied—at least up to a point. It is probably also true that in the industrial city the nuclear family of father, mother, and children alone gains new independence and importance as compared with the clan, lineage, or other larger kinship group; that the proportion of all people’s lives spent in tight-knit groups of friends,

neighbors, and kinsmen go down; and those impersonal situations and channels of communication assume a larger part in everyday life, although these are points of hot debate and vigorous qualification.

In general, urbanization is not only determined by the growth of population, but also by industrialization and the social development. Thus, it is necessary to see the socioeconomic and cultural aspects of urbanization in addition to its demographic aspects. However, urbanization in Turkey is more a phenomenon of concentration and movement of population than industrialization. Although in the big cities living conditions are better than in the rural areas in Turkey; they are not comparable to services available in Western cities. Therefore, urbanization does not provide urban facilities to a wide range of the urban population. On the contrary, it decreases the facilities available to the outlying areas because of the concentration of population in the cities. Furthermore, differences in the social and economic development among the areas support the imbalance. Thus, the lack of harmony between resources and needs grows increasingly in big cities.

2.2.1 The Urbanization of Individuals

Urbanization is social change, an adaptation process and a physical settlement process. The process of urbanization creates a different level of development and a different level of integration with urban lifestyles (Irmak, 1982). There is a difference between the practical and theoretical definitions of urbanization and “urbanization of individuals.” Urbanization is the

coordination of people who live as a community. On the other hand, “urbanization of the individual” refers to the coordination of human activities in these communities (Tilly, 1968).

It is necessary to see the rural and urban environments as totally different settlement styles and take into account functional connections between them. If the situations are evaluated by concepts of lifestyle, it is seen that there is a different cultural and socialization process and different perceptions of time and place between these two (Erkut, 1991). The determinants of urban life and physical place impose economic interdependence among individuals unlike rural life. Wirth (1938) claims that the urban lifestyle creates specific thinking and behavior. He also defines the relationship among individuals in urban areas as one of anonymity, superficiality, and temporality. He perceives this as an inevitable result of a heterogeneous and dense population. According to Erkut (1991), “urban people” are formed by highly specialized institutions; they are educated, skilled workers, who have and use leisure time.

The “urbanization of individuals” is sometimes confused with the “urbanization of the city.” The urbanization of individuals can be described as a result of urbanization and social change which shifts individuals behavior, relationships, values systems, morals, and lifestyles (Keles, 1980). In other words, in the process of urbanization, i.e., the dissolving from the rural area and concentrating in the city area, the migrants gain economic and social

characteristics of urban dwellers, but they gradually lose some of their rural characteristics (Kartal, 1983). In the process of the “urbanization of the individual,” economic and social space (activities) can include rural and urban characteristics at different levels. During the transformation from village person to urban person, these two spaces gradually eliminate rural values and adapt urban values (Kartal, 1983). Migrants are urbanized economically and socially over the course of time. Economic urbanization of the individual is accomplished by finding a job outside the agricultural sector. Social urbanization of the individual is accomplished through the acceptance of social and moral value systems, and the manifestation of urban characteristics (Senyapili, 1978).

Social structure and change cannot be examined as being separated from people who create the society, and the particular roles they play in society. Societal change is closely tied to a change in the social, economic, and political structures, as well as a change in people’s specialties, attitudes, and behavior (Kongar, 1985). In developing countries, the rapid growth of metropolitan areas and overpopulation, mixed with the problem of lack of institutionalization and organization, causes adaptation problems. The migrant’s adaptation process involves replacing or modifying known values and mores with the values and mores of the urban environment. If the migrant actively joins the economic,

political, and social organizations, this will make the adaptation process easier, creating a new social identity (Erkut, 1991).

2.3 Gecekondur (Squatter) in The Process of Urbanization

In the process of urbanization, mass migration from the countryside puts pressure on urban services and housing needs in developing countries.

Therefore, it results in unemployment, in lack of urban services, and in unhealthy housing, known in Turkey as the gecekondu phenomenon. The gecekondu phenomenon is indeed the story of a continuous mutual transformation involving changes in both migrants and city people. Gecekondu dwellers, while adapting to the urban environment in various unique ways, have also left their imprint on various aspects of urban life.

As I mentioned above, a visible effect of rapid urbanization is observed in the area of housing. The influx of rural migrants in unprecedented numbers led to demands for low-cost housing which could not be met either by government action or private market. As a response to the lack of housing in Turkish cities the newcomers have occupied land illegally and built gecekondu there. The term gecekondu refers to the illegal status, not to the standard of construction. The number of gecekondu increased rapidly from 100,000 units in 1950 to 1.25 million in 1983 (Danielson and Keles, 1985: 41).

The term gecekondu is also used to describe the areas inhabited by low-income people who migrate from rural areas to cities (Tatlidil, 1989). Developing

countries' rapid urbanization results in gecekondu, which surrounds the metropolitan areas of the city. Both the structure and the people of the gecekondu are different from low-income neighborhood, or slums of the developed countries. Slums surround the center of job areas in developed countries. Nevertheless, as far as the origin of these types of settlements are concerned, John Waterbury's (1978: 176) comment seems to hold true:

The slum exists because no nation is able to provide adequate housing at a cost workers can afford. It is the shelter that the industrial ages provides for its rank and file. Housing has remained the Cinderella of the Industrial Revolution and the humble cover to which she has been indefinitely assigned.

While the integration of individuals to city life is a problem for slums, the group's integration to the new city lifestyle is the problem for gecekondu. Consisting of low-income level groups, unskilled labor, and, usually, the unorganized sector, the gecekondu is an inseparable part of city. The gecekondu plays an important role in integrating its population, which migrates from rural to an urban areas, to urban way of life (Tatlidil, 1989).

The gecekondu is generally defined as "the dwelling unit on somebody else's site that was built in a way which is not approved by the general legal provisions for buildings and construction (Kongar, 1976: 205)." According to legislation No. 6188 which concerns the definition of illegally built houses, these residential units are: (1) against the city building and improvement plans and construction regulation (2) usually non-hygienic and built 'in a hurry' (hence,

the name gecekondu literally means ‘built overnight’) (Saran, 1974). Recently, research has shown that some of these definitions do not really conform to the realities of the gecekondu situation in Turkey. Indeed, most of these houses are in good sanitary condition and they are not built in violation of construction regulations. Also, due to the rising vote potential of these areas, politicians tend to legalize these settlements and improve their living conditions, especially at election time. Therefore, the gecekondu does not really fit the definitions provided for slums in developing nations.

Apart from the duality of the material conditions brought about by urbanization, the urbanization process has not led to the development of two rigidly separated worlds in the social sphere. In other words, the gecekondu sites do not represent an economically, socially and culturally segregated rural life on the margins of urban environment. Rapid urbanization in Turkey has not produced a large ‘lumpenproletariat’ alienated from the rest of society and prone to distributive political behavior (Danielson and Keles, 1980: 297). Instead, a broad societal transformation involving change in both migrants and urban people has occurred.

At first the gecekondu was illegal. Later on, it was legalized and became a functional part of a city. Thus, gecekondu (squatter) became a “natural” solution for the lack of housing in big cities (Kongar, 1985). In Turkey, sixty-five percent of city dwellers live in gecekondu areas. The largest proportion of the

gecekondu population originally comes from rural areas. Gecekondu areas play a very important part in the use of resources that are transferred from rural to urban areas (Kartal, 1983). For example, many migrants arrive in urban areas with a fair amount of wealth, having sold their property and possessions in the rural areas.

While gecekondu defines a kind of stratification within the city, there is certain stratification between gecekondu areas as well. For example, old gecekondu areas are the top tier of the stratification because these old gecekondu areas have public services and their residents now own title to their houses. On the other hand, as a result of economic policies, newcomers concentrate in new gecekondu areas (Kongar, 1985). These newer settlements are still illegal because the land is not owned by and titled to the residents. This may change over time.

Migration suppresses the differentiation in social relationships among individuals and allows for integrating social change. The social, economic and cultural differences between rural and urban areas lead to change in the relationships among individuals. There are two approaches to migration from rural areas to urban areas and the migrants' relationship with the city. First, the rural population that lives in the city will lose its rural values (neighborly deeds, kinship, family relationships, and solidarity). Urban values and habits will replace traditional culture. Because urban values are very different from

rural values, adaptation is harder for migrants who still have connections to rural areas.

Another approach examines the preservation of rural culture. Because cities in developing countries receive mass migration from rural areas in a very short time, the urbanization process results in individuals maintaining their identity as villagers. In other words, the gecekondu located next to the city is in many ways an extension of the rural area, with the reproduction and conservation of village culture and rural mode of life by migrants in the industrialized urban area (Tatlidil, 1989). This can be called the ruralization of cities. Economic forces counteract this phenomenon, eventually obliterating many rural cultural traits.

When the phenomena of the gecekondu's is taken into account, this settlement can simultaneously be considered a rural and urban area where individuals feel comfortable. However, both the individual's relationships and lifestyle still retain the characteristics of the rural area. In the course of time, rural sources turn into urban sources in the gecekondu. In the gecekondu areas where rural values are preserved, there is also a tendency towards urban values. According to Kartal (1983), this lifestyle is the result of keeping aspects of the different places together, so it is an expensive lifestyle. Another important feature of the gecekondu is the family's concern about improving their social status that often results in over-consumption. The process of assimilation of

gecekondu residents is never complete, and it can be said that gecekondu people try to close this social and economic gap through consumption. Their emphasis on kinship connections also reveals their insecure feelings in terms of social relationships in urban areas. The transition from rural to the urban services sector, division of labor and specialization of economic relationships brings political participation, trade unions, and the conscious searching for rights. This consciousness and use of urban opportunities accelerates the gecekondu family's appropriation of urban values (Kongar, 1982).

2.4. Research Question and Hypotheses

Research question: How does the degree of urbanization affect women's perceptions about consumption needs and consumer goods in three different neighborhoods in Izmir, Turkey?

Hypotheses

- 1. The greater the length of residence in the city, the more likely an individual is to possess a number of electrical appliances and expensive consumer goods.**
- 2. The more recent the migration, the more likely recent migrants are to state they only need "goods to survive."**
- 3. The more recent the migration is, the more concerned the migrants are with "things they do not possess."**
- 4. The recent migrants to the city are more likely perceive themselves as lacking many goods compared to long-term residents.**

5. **Women from the gecekondu area are less satisfied than native-urbanite women with their living standard.**
6. **The longer the length of residence in the city, the more likely the residents perceive the consumer items (i.e. automatic washer, dryer, dishwasher, food processor, VCR, stereo system, and press iron) as necessities.**
7. **The longer an individual resides in the city, the greater the self-perception that he/she can not live without consumer goods.**
8. **The longer an individual has lived in the city, the more likely the individual is to replace a goods when broken, rather than repair them.**
9. **The more recent the residency, the greater concern about the appearance of goods.**
10. **The more recent the residency, the less awareness of status attributes of goods.**
11. **The shorter the residency, the more prestige is attributed to quantity of goods owned.**
12. **The longer the residency, the more prestige is attributed to quality of goods owned.**
13. **The longer the residency, the more likely that quality is attributed to a prestigious brand.**
14. **The longer the residency, the greater awareness of quality certification.**
15. **The longer the residency, the greater importance given to brand name.**

16. Length of residency is directly proportional to self-perception of status (i.e., the shorter the residency, the lower their perception of their status).

Chapter 3

3. Methods

3.1 Description of Research Area

Izmir is the third biggest city in Turkey. Since 1927, migrants from rural areas have been moving to Izmir. Especially after the 1950s, Izmir's population grew rapidly. According to 1980s data, 103 people out of 1000 have moved to Izmir during the last five years. In the 1990 census report, the population growth was 30.14% in Izmir (Izmir Trade Center, 1993).

In Turkey there is a high rate of urbanization as a result of this migration. Therefore, poor and the rich urban neighborhoods are located side by side. There is a big difference among neighborhoods in terms of the distribution of population and dwelling style. According to housing style, 57.7% of the population live in apartments and 42.1% of the population live in the gecekondu (Turkish squatter housing) areas (Izmir Trade Center Report, 1993). Kiray (1979) describes apartments as the symbol of modernity and urbanization. Erman (1996: 767) describes the gecekondu as following:

Gecekondu settlements appeared in Turkey following World War II as the result of rapid urbanization of the country, which entailed large numbers of villagers migrating to cities. Because the cities were not ready, either physically or economically, to receive them, migrants built their own houses-- first in the geographically undesirable areas and later on in increasing numbers on the peripheries of the cities.Different from gecekondu housing that is mostly inhabited by rural migrants,

apartment housing in Turkey is predominantly occupied by the urban middle class.

As a result of the rapid growth, urbanization groups who have different socio-economic origins, values, attitudes and beliefs share the same urban area. These groups cannot easily integrate into an urban lifestyle. They have difficulties such as cultural adaptation problems and conflict between the rural values they brought from their villages and modern values. They try to overcome these problems through their consumption level because they cannot replace their traditional culture with the new urban culture. Trying to match consumption patterns of urbanized settlers becomes the safest way for newcomers to avoid conflict between their own values and the new ones. Consumption is the safest way because they do not have to change their values and beliefs in the short run. In my research, I studied the differences about the perception of consumption needs and goods between groups.

To show the differences among neighborhoods, housewives were chosen as the unit of analysis because women are seen as having a crucial role in household buying decisions. Thus, their perceptions of consumption needs and goods would provide us important insights. There are three different neighborhoods which differ socio-economically in the same city. I expected that they would have different understanding of needs of goods depending on their

residential area, how many years they have been in the city area, income level, age, and education level.

A survey research was conducted in Izmir, Turkey in 1993; Guzeltepe, Demirkopru and Aksoy were chosen as research areas. The most interesting part about these three neighborhoods is that they are located very close to each other. However, living conditions in these areas vary dramatically from location to location.

Guzeltepe is a gecekondu area. Gecekondu means “built in one night,” and refers to the shacks new immigrants built illegally overnight before the government could stop them. These immigrants are men or families who have recently migrated from rural villages to the city. Guzeltepe carries many significant characteristics of the gecekondu: First, houses are constructed on some other people’s or government’s land without any permission. Second, buildings do not have basic utilities. Third, this area does not have access to any services such as shopping malls, sport complexes, restaurants, and banks. Fourth, its population consists of people who migrate from the eastern part of Turkey’s villages, towns, and cities. Moreover, it still receives new migrants from those areas.

The second neighborhood, Demirkopru, consists of “semi-gecekondu” people. The semi-gecekondu is old gecekondu areas. However, when the city, grew these residencies stayed inside the metropolitan area. The residents live

near fully urbanized areas that are now officially recognized. People who live in the “semi-gecekondu” mainly come from villages around Izmir but have lived in the city for two decades or more. They are mainly lower middle and working class.

The last neighborhood, Aksoy, is an old residential neighborhood, located in the metropolitan area. It does not include any gecekondu house style, and high socio-economic level families live there. Aksoy also has many facilities, such as sport complexes, medical centers, and parks. It consists of middle class or wealthy residents who were born and raised in the city and are well adapted to urban culture. Many are well educated and all seem comfortable living in the city.

3.2 Characteristics of Women in Three Neighborhoods

Gecekondu women: Women who recently moved to the city from rural areas.

They are young, poorly educated or illiterate, and have high birth rates. They are in the process of adjusting to city life.

Semi-gecekondu women: Women who moved to the city one or two decades ago, or are city-born but still carry some of their traditional values. They are in the process of being urbanized. In other words, they are neither as traditional as the women in the gecekondu areas nor as modern as the women in the fully urbanized areas.

Urbanized women: Women who were born in the metropolitan city area and have access to social and cultural facilities. Compared to the women in the other areas, they are well educated.

All together three hundred women were chosen 100 hundred women from the three areas in a sample. They are non-working, married women, ranging in age from 25 to 54. Income levels ranged from low income to high. Questionnaires were conducted with 100 different individuals from each area. Interviews ran from 20 minutes to half an hour. The questionnaire form has 46 questions including questions about demographics, women's possessions, and their understanding of needs and goods. A face to face interview survey design was conducted primarily at the participants' homes. Data were gathered in 1993 over a period of about two months.

3.3 Sampling

A stratification sampling technique was used for increasing representation of different urbanization and income levels in the city. This technique was preferred in order to organize the population into homogenous subsets in terms of urbanization and income level. Each subset represents homogenous social characteristics in itself, but heterogeneous from others. The appropriate number of elements was then selected from each subset. To conduct the interviews, three clusters were chosen with each one representing a different subset's social characteristics. For the high urbanization and income subset,

Aksoy was chosen as a cluster then Demirkopru was selected for the middle level of urbanization and income subset, Guzeltepe is the low urbanization and low-income level cluster then from each area hundred women were chosen randomly.

These areas were chosen because of their socially composed structure and ease of conducting research in one cluster. Social characteristics of these areas were explained in detail above.

3.4 Demographic and Socioeconomic Characteristics of Women

This section examines major socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of gecekondu, semi-gecekondu, and metropolitan area populations. Specific attention is directed toward the characteristics of three areas' populations in recognition of the dynamic changes that are currently occurring in the populations of these areas.

In this chapter I will profile 300 women in the sample group in terms of place of birth, age and by neighborhood, level of education, length of time spent in urban area, places they lived before they came to Izmir, economic status, and family compositions.

3.4.1 Women's Place of Birth by Neighborhood

Women's place of birth is useful information to reveal the origins of women in the three resident areas. According to data evaluations in Aksoy, high percentage of women were born in urban areas (56% in Izmir, 7% in Istanbul

and Ankara, and 17% other cities). On the other hand, in Guzeltepe 93 % of women were born in rural areas (%74 in villages, 19% in towns). The percentage of urban born women rises in Demirkopru due to being an old gecekondü area.

Table 3.1 Women's Place of Birth by Neighborhood

BIRTH PLACE	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
Izmir	1.0	29.0	56.0	28.7
Towns near Izmir	1.0	12.0	13.0	8.6
Villages near Izmir	2.0	0.7
Istanbul - Ankara	1.0	1.0	7.0	3.0
Other cities	5.0	10.0	17.0	10.7
Other towns	18.0	12.0	4.0	11.3
Other villages	74.0	10.0	28.0
Abroad	24.0	3.0	9.0
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

3.4.2 Women's Age Distribution by Neighborhood

Age is viewed as an important segmentation variable (Kotler, 1997).

Residential variation in age distribution can be relevant in the evaluation of women's consumer behavior. For each sample the sampling frame of women was limited such that it included only women between the ages of 25 and 54. I excluded ages above 54 because consuming decreases after this age. The age groups are divided into three groups. Examination of the data contained in Table 3.2 provides some support for the popular image of gecekondü as a "home for the young"(Dobriner, 1963, Senyapili, 1981: 200).

Table 3.2 Women's Age Distribution by Neighborhood

AGE	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
25-34	69.0	56.0	31.0	52.0
35-44	24.0	29.0	42.0	31.7
45-54	7.0	15.0	27.0	16.3
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

Guzeltepe includes the highest percentage of young people, which can be explained by migration. This result is expected as young people generally migrate more than other age groups. The young age, a common feature of all gecekondu communities in Turkey, points to the existence of a group with a high potential to enter the labor force and integrate into urban life. Central city residents tend to be older than gecekondu residents. A description of the distribution of major age groups in metropolitan and nonurbanized areas is shown in Table 3.2.

3.4.3 Women's Level of Education by Neighborhood

Education level has been associated with variation in decision-making behavior by Katona and Mueller in 1965(Cited in Adams, 1977). Residential area differentials in educational attainment are evident. In Table 3.3 a statistical summary of educational characteristics of women is presented. These data reveal a higher level educational attainment for metropolitan areas, relative to nonurbanized areas. Further, comparing the nonmetropolitan areas of Guzeltepe and Demirkopru, Guzeltepe residents display the highest rate of

illiteracy, at %44. Fifty-six percent of the women of Aksoy graduated from high school and 20% from college.

Table 3.3 Level of Education by Neighborhood

LEVEL OF EDUCATION	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
Illiterate	44.0	6.0	16.7
Literate	8.0	8.0	5.3
Elementary School	41.0	70.0	12.0	41.0
Secondary School	3.0	11.0	12.0	8.6
High School	4.0	5.0	56.0	21.7
University	20.0	6.7
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

3.4.4 Length of Time Women Spent in the Urban Area

The length of time spent in the city is useful information in defining the urban experience of women. The percentage of women living in urban areas twenty or more years is as follows: Guzeltepe, 19%, Demirkopru, 61%, and Aksoy, 68%.

Table 3.4 Length of Time Women Spent in Urban Area by Neighborhood

THE LENGTH OF TIME	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
0-4 years	17.0	7.0	8.0	10.6
5-9 years	19.0	13.0	8.0	13.4
10-14 years	16.0	10.0	5.0	10.3
15-19 years	29.0	9.0	11.0	16.4
20 or more years	19.0	61.0	68.0	49.3
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

3.4.5 Place of Residence Prior to Moving to Izmir by Neighborhood

Examination of data contained in table 3.5 provides some support for the fact that migrants come from gecekondü areas from rural area yet, 85.3% of population in Guzeltepe from rural area.

Table 3.5 Place of Residence Prior to Moving to Izmir by Neighborhood

PLACE	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
Towns near Izmir	1.1	17.1	15.6	8.1
Villages near Izmir	7.3	1.9
Istanbul - Ankara	1.1	2.5	43.8	9.9
Other cities	12.5	26.8	34.3	20.5
Other towns	18.2	19.5	3.1	15.5
Other villages	67.1	19.5	41.6
Abroad	7.3	3.2	2.5
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

3.4.6 Husband's Occupation by Neighborhood

Income and occupation are popular demographic variables for segmenting markets (Kotler, 1997). Parsons states that the husband's occupation is the primary determiner of the family's style of life and status in the community (Cited in Ansbacher, 1967). There is a distinct residential occupational pattern. A description of the distribution of major occupational groups in metropolitan and nonurbanized areas is shown in Table 3.6. The data are consistent with the literature that the white-collar class, comprising of those employed in trade, in clerical, and in professional work, are proportionately more numerous in large cities and in metropolitan centers and in smaller towns

than in the country. Aksoy residents are mostly occupied in professional jobs (80%), whereas Guzeltepe residents are mostly occupied in unskilled labor (74%).

Table 3.6 Husband's Occupation by Neighborhood

PLACE	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
Government official	7.0	8.0	22.0	12.3
Blue collar worker	74.4	40.0	2.0	38.0
Craftsman	4.0	24.0	10.0
Trader-Industrialist	2.0	13.0	5.0
Tradesman	9.0	29.0	18.0	18.7
Manager	7.0	2.3
Retired	10.0	17.0	14.0	13.7
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

As far as social mobility is concerned, Senyapili (1981: 197, 198) has made the following observation: “ The Transition of migrants from unorganized to organized urban work is not realized in a clear, single step passage. Instead, the migrant draws a section of urban workspace reserved for him, according to his skills, experience and social relations in hopes of landing a permanent and secure job. ... Mobility is horizontal, not vertical and it does not provide upward class mobility curve between the points where his skills, experience, social relations and exogenous employment opportunities intersect”

3.4.7 Average Monthly Income by Neighborhood

Individuals in society want to fulfill their needs; therefore income is an important tool to provide the individual's and family's satisfaction of needs (Dikecligil, 1980).

Metropolitan area families generally earn higher average incomes than nonmetropolitan families. There are residential variations in occupational earnings. Aksoy residents earn more than gecekondu areas (see in Table 3.7).

Table 3.7 Average Monthly Income by Neighborhood

AVERAGE INCOME	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
\$65 or less than 65	21.0	5.0	8.7
\$66-\$130	42.0	16.0	19.3
\$131-\$195	24.0	27.0	17.0
\$196-\$260	9.0	14.0	2.0	8.3
\$261-\$325	3.0	24.0	9.0	12.0
\$326-\$390	1.0	10.0	13.0	8.0
\$391-\$455	4.0	14.0	6.0
\$456-\$520	9.0	3.0
\$521 or more	53.0	17.7
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

3.4.8 Family Composition by Neighborhood

In general, one can describe the family as the unit in which reproduction, socialization, economic division of labor and informal supportive relation take place. Social institution (Yesiltuna, 1994). The family particularly in Turkish society where the social structure of countryside is organized around the family. Even today, family attachments are still the main source of internal solidarity,

cohesion and continuity. Furthermore, extended families in most parts of rural Turkey still function as the center of social, economic, and political life at the local level. Thus modernization and change in Turkey can not be properly assessed without understanding the family structure, both as a nuclear unit of social arrangement and as a political and economic organization (Kandas, 1992, Karpat, 1964). Socio-economic factors play a major role in the emergence of such an arrangement in the urban setting; migrant families have to adapt to a situation where labor becomes the predominant means of economic subsistence. The transition from agricultural labor to wage labor means cash income and less dependence on having many children as a source of family labor.

In short, within the framework of urbanization, an analysis of the changes in the rural migrant family institution becomes crucial to a better understanding of the socio-cultural setting of the gecekondu communities in Turkey. As a matter of fact, urbanization and industrialization are often cited as two critical structural factors that closely influence the family institution. How the family adapts itself to changing circumstances can also provide ample insight in the cultural dynamics in Turkey.

The dynamic characteristic of social structure and the changes as a result of industrialization and urbanization impact family structure. Thus, traditional family structure functions and compositions changed according to new lifestyle.

In the process of change, families often transfer many functions to professional institutions (Yesiltuna, 1994).

Research on family structure in urban area has conveyed patterns that are in some ways different from the rural patterns. A statistical summary of family composition in three different residential areas is presented in Table 3.8.

Examination of Table 3.8 documents certain popular conceptualizations of residential area family compositions. The most striking feature revealed by the data is the high degree of structural similarity among gecekondu, semi-gecekondu and metropolitan families. Nuclear family structure is especially characteristic of urban areas (Sayin, 1990). Notably, Guzeltepe has a high percentage of nuclear families as opposed to extended families.

Table 3.8 Family Composition by Neighborhood

FAMILY MEMBERS	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPU %	AKSOY %	TOPLAM %
Husband only	5.1	14.0	25.0	14.7
Husband and children	80.8	70.0	69.0	73.3
Husband, children and parents	13.1	16.0	6.0	11.7
Husband, children and relatives	1.0	0.3
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

This can be explained by the fact that during the migration to the city, elderly family members remained in the village. Thus, traditional family structure dissolves. Timur (1981) argues that the extended family (in this study, the term 'extended family' refers to families in which at least a member from

maternal and/or paternal grandparent generation lives in the same household) is only an ideal or polar type that appears to be more of a sociological tradition than a statistical reality.

One of the inferences that can be made from the findings of this study is that the gecekondü family in Turkey has a nuclear structure as far as the composition of the household is concerned.

Chapter 4

4. Results and Discussions: Women's Understanding of Needs and Goods

"Could commodities themselves speak, they would say: in the eyes of each other we are nothing but exchange values."

-- (Marx, Capital, Vol. I in Willis, 1991)

Economists usually define the needs as following: Need is the sum of physical and sociological necessities that are vital to survive. Needs are continuous and they should be satisfied constantly. For example, nobody can survive by eating only once (Hancerlioglu, 1986). Humans use tools to satisfy needs; as needs are satisfied, new needs arise and techniques of production are improved (Bendix, 1967). According to Baudrillard (1988: 36), "for the economists, there is the notion of 'utility.' Utility is the desire to consume a specific commodity, that is to say, to nullify its utility. Need is therefore already embedded in commodities on the market. And preferences are manipulated by the arrangement of products already offered on the market: this is in fact an elastic demand." I will try to describe needs in terms of social necessities. Instead of assuming that goods are primarily needed for subsistence plus competitive display, suppose that they are needed for making visible and stable the categories of culture. According to Douglas and Isherwood, (1997:59) "It is standard ethnographic practice to assume that all material possessions carry social meanings and to concentrate a main part of cultural analysis upon their use as communicators." Some theorists classify in two different ways: basic

needs, such as eating, and non-basic needs, such as entertainment. Other theorists distinguish between natural (instinctive) and learned needs; eating is a natural (instinctive) need, but smoking is a learned need. A third classification used by other theorists is physical and cultural needs. For these individuals eating is a physical need, but listening to music is a cultural need. Moreover, needs have a parallel evolution to the evolution of human beings. For instance, today's housing needs differ from three hundred years ago. Maslow's hierarchy of human needs model specifies five need categories: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1954).

Arndt (1978) classifies social needs as those related to relationships among individuals and the relationship between individuals and the society. Ger (1992) classifies "having needs," which are those related to material possessions and Physiological needs, e.g., house/neighborhood, income, employment, skills, jobs, health, safety, and education.

Katz (1955) identifies universal human needs as an instrumental and adjustive, while Hanna (Cited in Sheth, 1991) proposes seven consumer needs: Physical safety, material security, material comfort, acceptance by others, recognition from others, influence over others and personal growth.

Some social scientists believe that satisfaction of needs depends upon the provision of goods. It is assumed that the world of goods becomes complicated

when the needs of individuals or community become more varied and complicated. Thus, it is claimed that there is a relationship between human needs and the function of goods. However, this view excludes some important characteristics of needs, especially social and psychological needs.

Goods are produced depending on economic conditions and productivity, but needs are created based on social differentiation. Therefore, goods are limited, but needs are unlimited. Society generates both goods and needs. Needs cannot be satisfied completely, so people try to acquire goods one after another to satisfy their needs (Baudrillard, 1988). This results in rapid growth in consumption. As a result, the functional relationship between goods and needs is not the reason for acquiring goods. That means goods are not used only as a tool to satisfy needs.

Although needs change over time depending on historical development of production capacity, production focuses on satisfying tangible needs. Classical economic theory defines production as a way of satisfying tangible needs. However, need is the inadequacy resulting from the modification one has with his or her environment, or the awareness of that adequacy. In other words, need is a feeling about an object that causes tension if the person does not have it and which needs to be owned in order to balance the feeling of deprivation (Bilgin, 1992). Shiffman and Kanuk, (1991: 54) posit that “All individuals have needs, wants, and desires. The individual’s subconscious drive to reduce his need.

Induced tension results in behavior that the anticipates will satisfy his needs and thus restore him to a more comfortable state.”

As economist John Kenneth Galbraith (1976: 154) has pointed out, it is not true that manufacturers seek to satisfy the wants of consumers. Actually, manufacturers create those wants by means of the advertising they use. In a real sense, desires are never satisfied. The more one has the more one wants. “The more wants that are satisfied the more new ones are born.”

Goods have meaning beyond their use value. People give some meaning to goods beyond their technical use. As a result, industrial goods become a status symbol. For example, a car is a status symbol rather than only a beneficial vehicle for transportation.

In the following section, I will try to find out: (1) how women think in the sample about needs and goods (2) what kind of meaning they attribute to goods; (3) how they link the relationship between goods and social status and how they relate this with their status; and (4) how they view brand and quality.

4.1 Women’s Possessions by Neighborhood

The goods owned by people are significant value to show the differences in standard of living. Subjects were asked whether they own appliances from a fixed list of consumer goods (see Table 1). Although these appliances seem to be easy to obtain for everyone in the U.S., these goods are relatively new and very

expensive in Turkey. Therefore, only people with a high-income level can acquire them. These goods represent prestige and status.

Table 4.1: Women's Possessions by Neighborhood

GOODS	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
B&W TV	38.0	35.0	10.0	27.7
Color TV	70.0	78.0	100.0	82.7
Stove	54.0	76.0	97.0	75.7
Telephone	32.0	60.0	98.0	63.3
Vacuum Cleaner	30.0	73.0	100.0	67.7
Auto. Washer	12.0	36.0	94.0	47.3
Stereo System	20.0	32.0	70.0	40.7
VCR	7.0	18.0	62.0	29.0
Dish Washer	1.0	4.0	61.0	22.0
Food Processor	2.0	29.0	83.0	38.0
Microwave	0.0	3.0	15.0	6.0
Computer	0.0	3.0	21.0	8.0
Car	2.0	26.0	65.0	31.0

1. $X^2 = 23.61$ 2. $X^2 = 33.68$ 3. $X^2 = 50.22$ 4. $X^2 = 94.50$ 5. $X^2 = 113.93$ 6. $X^2 = 142.59$
 $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$

7. $X^2 = 56.47$ 8. $X^2 = 82.27$ 9. $X^2 = 133.21$ 10. $X^2 = 144.39$ 11. $X^2 = 144.39$ 12. $X^2 = 35.05$
 $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$

13. $X^2 = 94.53$
 $P < 0.01$

Living conditions in Turkey are a key indicator in understanding the importance that goods, such as an automatic washer and dishwasher, have in Turkish life. While living conditions in Turkey vary dramatically from location to location, some observations can be made that illustrate how living conditions may affect consumption behavior.

The television and automatic washer have emerged as perhaps the most symbolic purchase an individual makes in Turkey. Part of the reason for this phenomenon lies with the fact that the Turkish public is still restricted in the number of product categories available to them because of high inflation and financial problems. Therefore, certain products have developed symbolic consumption importance for Turkish consumers, such as a color TV and automatic washer for gecekondü people, and cars or houses for high-income level people. The importance of these items cannot be explained solely by financial logic; these are also symbols of economic freedom.

4.2 Women's Perception of Needs by Neighborhood

Need is defined as the sum of physical and social necessities that are vital to survive. The sampling group was questioned about the meaning of need. Results support that women's understanding of consumption needs is determined by their own group and their reference group which may be the same group, or two different group.

A chi-square test to analyze whether or not any difference in understanding of needs by neighborhood resulted in a significant finding ($p < 0.01$) (see Table 2). The percentage of the women interviewed who define needs as "goods that they desire to own" is 11% in Guzeltepe and Demirkopru, and 9% in Aksoy. The percentage of the women who define needs as "goods that are necessary for living" is 55% in Guzeltepe, 83% in Demirkopru and 87% in

Aksoy. I can attribute the reason why comparatively higher ratios are observed in Demirkopru and Aksoy than in Guzeltepe to women living a generally more prosperous life in the former areas compared to the latter. For this reason, they already own most goods they desire to own in their household.

Table 4.2: Understanding of Needs by Neighborhood

NEED CONCEPT	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Goods needed to survive	55.0	83.0	87.0	75.0
Goods that they do not posses	34.0	6.0	4.0	14.7
Goods that they desire to own	11.0	11.0	9.0	10.3
Total	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 46.728 \quad P < 0.01$$

Everything necessary for living is restricted by everything required for living within their own surroundings. This is the natural outcome of having three locations with different standards of living.

The percentage of women who define needs as “goods that they do not possess” is 34% in Guzeltepe, 6% in Demirkopru, and 4% in Aksoy. This high percentage in Guzeltepe is particularly meaningful because these women come from a low-income level. Although they are aware of a variety of goods in the market, they cannot obtain them as much as their reference groups.

There is a highly significant difference among neighborhoods in terms of owning enough goods. To be able to test this concept, respondents were asked, “Do you feel that you have enough goods?” The answers support expectations.

Table 4.3: Do Women Think They Have Enough Goods?

GOODS	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Too many missing	74.0	36.0	8.0	40.0
Some missing	15.0	23.0	30.0	22.0
Enough goods	11.0	41.0	62.0	38.0
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 97.900 \quad P < 0.01$$

The number of goods they own causes much more tension in women from the gecekondu area. Seventy-four percent of these women think they are lacking too many goods in their homes. This reveals that they want to integrate with city life by owning goods similar to residents in a wealthy neighborhood. Guzeltepe residents are a relatively young age group. As a result, their expectations might be higher. The percentage (36%) is relatively low in Demirkopru because of higher integration to city life than in Guzeltepe.

The percentage is only 8% in Aksoy. On the other hand, the percentage of women who think “they have everything they need” is the highest in Aksoy (62%). The reason for this might be explained by high satisfaction with their belongings among Aksoy residents. They have more opportunity to acquire desired goods due to their high-income level

As illustrated, women from all areas give meaning to goods beyond their use value. Therefore, while they determine what type of goods they purchase or

desire to have, they choose goods that reflect their social status or the status of their reference group. In this way, they try to reach the consumption standard of their reference groups to become a part of this social class. If they consume less than this standard, they feel deprivation and conscious of this deprivation. This situation causes stress and unhappiness among individuals. To be able to resolve this emotional conflict, they need to own the missing goods. It seems that people who think they do not own enough goods are not satisfied with their social position. They believe owning more goods is a way of entering a higher social status. Another question asked about the same issue is, “Are you satisfied with your standard of living?” Significant differences among the neighborhoods are found in answers to this question that parallel the previous results.

Table 4.4: Satisfaction with Living Standards by Neighborhood

SATISFACTION	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Satisfactory	18.0	28.0	54.0	33.3
Less Satisfactory	22.0	41.0	23.0	28.7
Unsatisfactory	60.0	31.0	23.0	38.0
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 48.644 \quad P < 0.01$$

The percentage of women who think their living standards are not satisfactory is 60% in Guzeltepe, 31% in Demirkopru, and 23% in Aksoy. Women who think they do not have enough goods also think that their living standards are not satisfactory (see Table 4). Women in Aksoy, who have the highest percentage for being satisfied with their belongings, also have the highest

percentage (54%) for being satisfied with their living standards. This shows that Aksoy residents are more satisfied with their social status relative to others. In other words, they are aware of being in more preferable conditions than others. On the other hand, women from Guzeltepe and Demirkopru think that they consume less than their reference group's standards, so they become unsatisfied with their living standards.

In sum, having unsatisfied needs leads to greater perceived relative deprivation among gecekondu women. Gecekondu women compare themselves with a reference group a little above (Demirkopru) and also with a group further above (Aksoy). So they may feel even less satisfaction than previously, although they may be relatively better off compared to the past or to the relatives left behind in the village.

To understand the idea of needs more clearly, respondents were asked to indicate which items on a fixed list of consumer goods they regarded as necessities. For example, how do they see the use of appliances such as an automatic washer, dryer, dishwasher, and food processor? Are they a necessity or a luxury? The given answers also clarify how willing they are to transfer housework from manual labor to work by automation.

Although women who live in the gecekondu area do not necessarily know how to use many appliances, they see these appliances as a need. A dryer is defined as a need for only 17% in the high and middle-income level

neighborhood. However, it is defined as an important need for 38% in the gecekondu area. Due to the widespread use of automatic washers, women from all areas think that the machine is an important need (Guzeltepe 81%, Demirkopru 83%, and Aksoy 100%).

Table 4.5: Classification of Some Durable Goods on a Necessity and Luxury Basis by Neighborhood

DURABLE GOODS	GUZELTEPE			DEMIRKOPRU			AKSOY		
	Lux. %	Nec. %	Tot. %	Lux. %	Nec. %	Tot. %	Lux. %	Nec. %	Tot. %
1. Automatic Washer	19.0	81.0	100.0	17.0	83.0	100.0	0	100.0	100.0
2. Dryer	62.0	38.0	100.0	83.0	17.0	100.0	83.0	17.0	100.0
3. Dish Washer	52.0	48.0	100.0	71.0	29.0	100.0	24.0	76.0	100.0
4. Food Processor	56.0	44.0	100.0	47.0	53.0	100.0	36.0	64.0	100.0
5. VCR	56.0	44.0	100.0	73.0	27.0	100.0	75.0	25.0	100.0
6. Stereo System	36.0	64.0	100.0	32.0	68.0	100.0	36.0	64.0	100.0
7. Press Iron	51.0	49.0	100.0	76.0	24.0	100.0	63.0	37.0	100.0

1. $X^2 = 20.644$ 2. $X^2 = 16.118$ 3. $X^2 = 44.738$ 4. $X^2 = 8.070$ 5. $X^2 = 10.018$
 $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.05$ $P < 0.01$
6. $X^2 = 0.471$ 7. $X^2 = 13.464$
 $P > 0.05$ $P < 0.01$

Although the food processor and commercial type of press iron are not vital appliances, women from all areas define these devices as a necessity rather than a luxury. In Guzeltepe, the proportion of women who mention a VCR as a need is the highest (44%), which seems to contradict expectations based on the income level of Guzeltepe residents. The percentages for the same question are 27% in Demirkopru and 25% in Aksoy. It is interesting that although Aksoy residents own more VCRs than those of Guzeltepe, they usually think of it as a luxury (75%). This statement might imply that women from the gecekondu area

desire to buy new appliances in order to own more goods. Similarly, the highest percentage (49%) of women who think of the press iron as a need live in Guzeltepe. The percentages in Demirkopru and Aksoy are 24% and 37%, respectively. Almost every appliance is seen by women who live in the gecekondu area as a need, compared to women from semi-gecekondu and city center areas. In Guzeltepe, it is observed that although stereo systems and VCRs are not used much, women desire to own these products very much. It can be argued that Guzeltepe residents give more importance to owning the good than to the use of it. This is additional evidence that women in this area give different meanings to owning these products beyond their functions. In other words, owning these products is perceived as a symbol of being a city resident.

4.3 Understanding Of Goods among Women

It is important to understand people's attitudes towards goods to understand how they value the goods. To gather information about this subject, I tested six expressions, to which we asked subjects to respond with one of the three following answers: strongly agree, slightly agree, and not agree. The expressions are:

- 1. Goods make life easier.**
- 2. I cannot think of life without goods.**
- 3. Goods should be used until they wear out.**
- 4. Owning more than one of the same good is good in case of emergency.**
- 5. Instead of fixing the broken good, I had better get a new one.**

6. I prefer to update my goods when they become old-fashioned.

An analysis of the data indicates that women from all areas strongly agree with the statement, “goods make life easier.” The percentages are 77% in Guzeltepe, 75% in Demirkopru, and 85% in Aksoy. The higher percentage in Aksoy might be explained by the higher income level and access to modern-technology products compared to Guzeltepe and Demirkopru.

The percentage of women who agree with “I cannot think of life without goods” is the highest in Guzeltepe (86%), where households possess fewer items than other areas. While the percentage of women who agree with “owning more than one of the same good is good in case of emergency” is 32% in Aksoy and Demirkopru, this percentage is slightly higher in Guzeltepe (41%).

Similarly, Guzeltepe residents agree with “instead of fixing the broken good, I had better get a new one” more than other areas: 30%, as opposed to 12% and 9% in Demirkopru and Aksoy, respectively.

The percentage of women who agree with “I prefer to update my goods when they become old-fashioned” is the highest in Guzeltepe, at 43%, compared to 31% in Demirkopru, and 33% in Aksoy.

As a result of the survey, it might be argued that the gecekondü residents do not have many consumer goods that are included in the survey (see Table1), so they desire to own these products more than residents in other areas do.

Table 4.6: How Women Perceive Goods by Neighborhood

*
** % Strongly Agree
** % Slightly Agree
*** % Not Agree

% Total

	GUZELTEPE				DEMIRKOPRU				AKSOY			
EXPRESSIONS ABOUT PERCEPTION OF THE GOODS	*	**	**	**	*	**	**	**	*	**	***	**
1. Goods make life easier	77	5	18	100	75	5	20	100	85	8	7	100
2. I cannot think of life without goods	86	4	10	100	81	5	14	100	61	18	21	100
3. Goods should be used until they wear out	88	1	11	100	82	3	15	100	63	14	23	100
4. Owning more than one of the same good is good in case of emergency	41	1	58	100	32	3	65	100	32	8	60	100
5. Instead of fixing the broken good, you had better get a new one	30	5	65	100	12	7	81	100	9	11	80	100
6. You should update your goods when they become old-fashioned	43	4	53	100	31	4	65	100	33	28	39	100

1. $X^2 = 3.242$ 2. $X^2 = 22.294$ 3. $X^2 = 25.291$ 4. $X^2 = 8.468$ 5. $X^2 = 19.744$ 6. $X^2 = 40.789$
 $P > 0.05$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$ $P > 0.05$ $P < 0.01$ $P < 0.01$

In all areas, the characteristics of the durable goods most desired are reliability (44%) and usefulness (35.7%). Fifty-five percent of Guzeltepe residents prefer reliable goods, but only 17% of them prefer practical goods. Moreover, 14% of them prefer ostentatious goods. The higher importance given ostentatious goods in Guzeltepe might be explained by the residents' lack of

satisfaction with their social conditions. Therefore, they want to have expensive and ostentatious goods in order to suppress this lack of satisfaction.

Table 4.7: Desired Characteristics of Goods by Neighborhood

CHARACTERISTIC	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Modern	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0
Reliability	55.0	42.0	35.0	44.0
Usefulness	17.0	39.0	51.0	35.7
Original	4.0	1.0	3.0	2.7
Ostentatious	14.0	8.0	1.0	7.6
Total	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 34.148 \quad P < 0.01$$

In Demirkopru, reliability (42%) and usefulness (39%) are the most important characteristics of the goods. In contrast, usefulness (51%) is higher than reliability (35%) in Aksoy, and ostentation is not important (1%). The attitude of Aksoy residents towards the ostentatious goods might be explained by their high satisfaction with their social status. Therefore, they might not need to prove their status with owning ostentatious goods.

On the other hand, I should be aware of the possibility of biased answers given by respondents because they sometimes answer the questions based on the interviewer's expectation rather than their own opinion.

In conclusion, the results show that from the gecekondü through the wealthy neighborhood, reliability and usefulness become increasingly important, but ostentation becomes less and less important.

4.3.1 Women's Perception of the Relationship Between Social Status And Goods

There is a close relationship between belongings and social status. People express this opinion with such expressions as: "this product is not for us" or "this product is only for rich people." Holt (1997: 335) states similar idea: "consumption objects are malleable semiotic resources that different people can consume in different ways to enact their tastes." Weber (Cited in Ansbacher, 1967: 196) claims that status "is normally expressed by...a specific style of life [of] all those who wish to belong to the circle." A given status group develops a specific life style and demands its members to adhere to it.

Social status, when interpreted from the perspective of behavior that an individual can expect from others, is related to the goods that the individual may eventually possess or expect to possess (Bilgin, 1992, Belk, Bahn, Mayer, 1982). In general, individuals play certain types of roles depending on the expectations of their social status (Mott, 1972, Goffman, 1951). Social status becomes a part of an individual's self-image and self-consciousness, and it shapes the lifestyle of the individual. Nevertheless, status determines the acceptable behavior of the individual in society.

Individuals are deeply rooted to their status as a social being. Social status explains the individual's values, attitudes and desires. Social status affects acquiring goods as well. Social status usually defines what type of products an

individual can have or expect to have (Bilgin,1992). As a result, goods evoke a value of social prestige, and individuals perceive status signs in various goods at different levels.

Table 4.8: Women's Perception of Relationship between Status and Goods by Neighborhood

RELATIONSHIP	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Exists	54.0	63.0	64.0	60.3
Not-Exists	19.0	25.0	34.0	26.0
No Idea	27.0	12.0	2.0	13.7
Total	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 41.006 \quad P < 0.01$$

When the data was examined, it was found that there is a significant difference among the three areas for understanding the relationship between social status and goods. In all areas, women state that there is a relationship between goods and status (Guzeltepe 54%, Demirkopru 63% and Aksoy 64%). This shows that these women perceive the goods as a tool for gaining a higher social status and for giving a meaning to goods beyond their use value.

At first sight, the goods-status relationship seems to be related to quantity of products. This opinion originated in economic politics, which measures the development by income level and the level of owned goods and services. Social differentiation is also related to differentiation in structural characteristics and the quality of goods. However, social status is still commonly related to the amount of wealth in most societies. When being wealthy is defined by the

quantity of goods, the more goods people have, the more status they have (Bilgin, 1992).

Table 4.9: Perceived Prestige Measured by Owning of Goods by Neighborhood

CHARACTERISTIC	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Number of the goods	23.0	17.5	7.5	16.0
Quality of the goods	25.7	25.0	53.6	35.9
Modern	10.8	10.0	6.0	8.8
Expensive	39.2	42.5	26.9	35.4
Original	1.3	5.0	6.0	3.9
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 11.087 \quad P > 0.05$$

To make clear the relationship between status and goods, we try to understand how people perceive the goods belonging to people with high social status. For this purpose, we asked the respondents what they think about the goods owned by high social status people. Although there is not a significant difference among answers, we can make some conclusions from the results.

In all areas, monetary value (39.2% in Guzeltepe, 42.5% in Demirkopru, and 26.9% in Aksoy) and quality (25.7% in Guzeltepe, 25% in Demirkopru and 53.6% in Aksoy) of the goods are important characteristics. Women from Aksoy, who have relatively high status, emphasize quality more than other areas. Giving more importance to quality is usually seen among individuals with a high-income level. Aksoy residents are an example of individuals with a high-income level. In contrast, women who live in Guzeltepe stated that the quantity of goods is most important. Twenty-three percent think the larger the quantity of goods,

the higher the status level. One might say that these women make a connection between quantity of goods and high status because they are not able to afford as many goods as they desire.

As a result, the most important characteristics of the goods that reflect social status are monetary value, quality and quantity. The quantity and value of the goods a household owns are perceived as a function of income and wealth. However, when individuals are labeled *nouveau riche* or “tasteless” by their choice of consumer goods, this is a reflection of non-acceptance into a higher social status.

4.3.2 Understanding of Brand Names among Women

Consumers make decisions about goods based on some objective and subjective criteria such as price, quality and appearance. In this section, I intend to find out how women form their ideas about quality. Are they driven by the commercial image or the objective quality of the goods?

Table 4.10: Understanding of Quality by Neighborhood

QUALITY	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Prestigious Brand	8.0	3.0	4.0	5.0
Heavily Advertised	1.0	1.0	0	0.7
Expensive	15.0	11.0	1.0	9.0
Commonly Purchased	1.0	9.0	3.0	4.3
Warranty and TSE	21.0	32.0	71.0	41.3
Durable	54.0	44.0	21.0	39.7
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 71.196 \quad P < 0.01$$

In all areas, long lasting, warranty, and Turkish Standard Institute (TSE) certificate of the goods are stressed as the most important elements of quality. The percentage of women who think long lasting is enough for quality is 54% in Guzeltepe, 44% in Demirkopru and 21% in Aksoy. The percentage of women who require warranty and TSE certificate for quality is 21% in Guzeltepe, 32% in Demirkopru and 71% in Aksoy. The greater the degree of urbanization, the more attention warranty and TSE certificate receive.

This suggests to me that Aksoy residents may be more aware of the future problems of the goods and want to take control of prospective problems. Their relatively high education level and more knowledge about city life compared to others might explain why Aksoy residents give more importance to certified goods. Throughout all areas, there are very few women who reference highly advertised or expensive goods as quality goods.

4.3.2.1 How Much Importance Women Give to Brand Name

The American Marketing Association defines a brand as follows: “A brand is a name, term, sign, symbol, or design, or a combination of them, intended to identify the goods or services of one seller or group of sellers and to differentiate them from those of competitors (Kotler, 1997: 443).”

Although our interpretations on brand preferences are not valid for everybody, people want to own a prestigious brand’s product at least once in their lifetime. For example, even if the less-known brands have almost the same

quality, functions and usefulness as a well-known one, people usually attribute more value to the well-known brand than the less-known one.

Holt (1997: 333) stresses the symbolic meaning of objects: “social meanings are located in the consumption objects. Thus, anyone who consumes the same category or brand of object is partaking in the same meaning to greater to less extent, depending on the success of their symbolic consumption.”

As we mentioned above, brand concept affects buying behavior as a function of symbol, image and judgment. If consumers are not knowledgeable enough about the technical or material structure of a product, they tend to prefer a well-known brand to feel more prestigious.

In industrialized societies, products and services are very similar to each other as a result of mass production. Therefore, producers try to differentiate their products from those of competitors by developing brand awareness of their products.

Table 4.11: Importance of Brand Name by Neighborhood

BRAND	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Very Important	35.0	35.0	37.0	35.6
Sometimes	8.0	11.0	21.0	13.4
Unimportant	57.0	54.0	42.0	51.0
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 9.277 \quad P > 0.05$$

Another area for investigation is how important brand name is to women. Although there is not a significant difference between brand attribute and socio-

economic condition, I can state the following: Fifty-one percent of all women in the sampling group say that brand names are not important. The percentage of women in this category increases slightly in the gecekondu area. Twenty-one percent of Aksoy residents state they sometimes give importance to the brand, as opposed to 8% in Guzeltepe and 11% in Demirkopru. Their high-income level might explain this higher percentage among Aksoy residents.

4.4 How Women Perceive Their Socio-Economic Status

There is a significant difference among women in terms of how they perceive their social level. Women's perceptions about their social level are associated with their income level.

Thirty-nine percent of Guzeltepe residents state their position as "low," related to their income level and the area where they live. However, the highest percentage (45%) of Guzeltepe residents defines their status as "middle," although it is quite possible women define themselves as "middle" because of the negative association with "low."

Table 4.12: How Women Perceive Their Socio-Economic Status

SOCIAL STATUS	GUZELTEPE %	DEMIRKOPRU %	AKSOY %	TOTAL %
Low	39.0	15.0	4.0	19.3
Middle-Low	16.0	13.0	5.0	11.3
Middle	45.0	70.0	70.0	61.7
Upper-Middle	0	2.0	21.0	7.7
TOTAL	100	100	100	300

$$X^2 = 80.644 \quad P < 0.01$$

“Middle” is a more moderate term compared to “low,” so the majority of answers indicate “middle” (45% in Guzeltepe, 70% in Demirkopru and Aksoy).

While there are no women who see themselves as “upper middle” in Guzeltepe and only 2% of Demirkopru residents see themselves in this category, 21% of women from Aksoy feel that they can be counted as “upper middle.”

Chapter 5

5. Conclusion

Traditionally in Turkey, interpersonal connections were very important to human relationships were based on interpersonal connections. In today's societies, it is goods that often create a link between individuals. Therefore, consumption, buying and spending habits gained importance. In modern countries, infrastructure (e.g. education, health, and transportation) is provided by bureaucratic institutions. Basic human needs are fulfilled systematically for the general benefit of the community and the costs are shared (i.e. through taxes). The resulting dependency on institutionalized services makes the individual a passive consumer of products (Illich, 1970). Eventually, through such services as schools, individuals develop awareness of “better” things. The awareness may become a desire for these things (goods/services). And a consumer emerges. People attempt to control nature through technology and, ironically, become controlled themselves by technology (Kongar, 1985). In other words the so-called “better” products (via technology) may in fact harm the individual or community. The use of scarce money for status symbols in gecekondu undermines the ability of poor people to meet basic family needs. Generations may pass before institutions step into provide.

In Turkey, rapid changes occurred in the process of integrating into the world economic system. Instead of a productive economy, a consumer economy

grew which was characterized by hypermarkets, cars, jeans, fast foods, billboards, and television (Gurbilek, 1992). A high level of consumption becomes a measurement of success in a society, and human relationships, love, and friendship turn into commodities that can be traded. The creation of new needs through advertisement gives people a feeling of “freedom by consumption.” The freedom of choice in consumption gives a false sense of freedom. Fromm (1968) defines this as “being king at the supermarket.” According to this idea, the individual’s identity is constructed by the act and style of consumption. There is a famous picture in which a hand is holding a card that looks like a credit card. On the card it says, “I am shopping, therefore I am.” This picture shows the duality of the fetishism of goods that shapes both the individual and action. If shopping is being, buying a certain brand will be the tool of creating a social identity (Wills, 1993).

Especially, integration to the urban way of life becomes a very important issue for gecekondu people as new comers of a city. Thus, they are more open to influences (e.g. advertising, or peer activities) that aim to create a consumer society. It is also expected that gecekondu people will make more of an effort to be part of consumer society. Therefore, while social integration may be closed for gecekondu people, economic integration will always be open.

I posit that owning consumer goods, and consumption patterns reveal the level of integration into city life. Dwelling areas are seen as a symbol of different

lifestyles; this research demonstrates that there are statistically significant differences for residential areas. The specific culture that affects the lives of women in particular is one that stimulates more and more consumption. The basic explanation for this phenomenon lies in the fact that gecekondu families have started to constitute a demographic majority in metropolitan areas, which are the main operating grounds of capitalist market relations in Turkey. As mentioned earlier, 65 percent of the people living in Izmir are not originally from this city. Their participation in the consumer market must be encouraged if the market is to enlarge. And one of the basic mechanisms to ensure their increasing participation is a mass media tool, such as TV ads. Surveys have proven that, despite the low incomes of most gecekondu families, the purchase of expensive durable consumer goods has always been quite widespread. According to the results of this survey, there were almost as many durable consumer goods in these houses as in the middle class ones. This finding is consistent with the fact that in the economic space, gecekondu families are not severely segregated from the middle classes even though they differ in income and occupation (Senyapili, 1981: 206).

To reiterate, one of the biggest channels for integration offered by the urban environment to the migrants is the heavy consumption patterns. The gecekondu families seem to participate in this channel willingly and completely. Both TV and simple reading material, which penetrates the “socially hungry

gecekondu environment," impose a consumption-oriented value system that also enhances the integration process for the migrants.

In the first section of this study, demographic characteristics of women were obtained in terms of residency area. It shows that the numbers of native-urbanites is concentrated in Aksoy. Education level is higher in Aksoy than in gecekondu areas. The women's length of time spent in the city is longer for Aksoy than Guzeltepe residents. In the previous settlement area examined, data have shown that Guzeltepe and Demirkopru residents originally came from rural areas. On the other hand, Aksoy residents are native-urbanites. The distribution of jobs found that unskilled workers are concentrated in gecekondu and semi-gecekondu, whereas professional workers, traders, clerk, and merchandisers are concentrated in urbanized area. The household income increases from gecekondu areas to urbanized areas. The composition of the nuclear family structure is consistent for all three areas. However, in terms of family relations, gecekondu people still apply traditional patterns that give the father much power. My findings show that there is a relationship among residence area and income, occupation, and education. I looked at women's reasons for buying new consumer goods such as washing machines and automatic dishwashers. These are relatively new appliances in Turkey and are very expensive. Some washing machines cost as much as 1000 dollars. The people in the long-term urban neighborhood could usually afford these consumer items and

were very familiar with their use. Some of the "semi-gecekondu" residents now live near fully urbanized areas that are officially recognized. They can sometimes afford these appliances, and usually understand how to use and manage them. The "gecekondu," however, will often buy expensive consumer items yet never use these appliances. Newcomers want to integrate into urban areas by buying things that urban settlers use. Therefore, they aspire to buy the goods and appliances they feel urban people must have—even if they cannot afford or use them. They will continue to wash clothes by hand while a new machine sits idle. They also try to buy color televisions—often instead of buying food or wood to heat the houses. One of the subjects stated that she bought the color TV not to be ashamed in front of her neighbors “keeping up with the Joneses” fashion. Even without education or familiarity with urban life, the "gecekondu" try to become full urban settlers through their consumption behavior. Their ultimate dream is to buy a car and to move into an apartment building with all the luxuries. These symbols of urban life are much more important to them than obtaining education or enjoying the fine cultural offerings of cities such as theater, music and art.

In terms of dwelling area, women’s perception of needs is important to show the gap between their present status and the status to which they want to belong. In answer to the question, “what is a need for you?” 34% of the women in Guzeltepe answered “things we do not possess,” compare to 6% in Demirkopru and 4% in Aksoy. In all areas what women want to own and what

they do own shows that there is a big gap between their present status and the status level they want to reach. Women in all three areas stated that there is a relationship between social status and owning goods; high social status people's goods are expensive, ostentatious, and of high quality.

Data show that the women in gecekondu areas are less satisfied with their lifestyle than women in other areas. Similarly, they agree with the expression, "I cannot think of life without goods" (Guzeltepe 86%, Demirkopru 81%, Aksoy 61%). This result shows us gecekondu women are overly concerned with owning goods. The women's perception of durable goods and the given importance to durable goods reveals the level of women's expectations. In the earliest phase of urbanization, the importance of durable goods greatest. Transformation from a rural way of life to an urban way of life requires giving importance to durable goods such as a washing machine and dishwasher. Thus, urbanization is an important factor for changing consumption patterns. The data has shown that gecekondu women, as a result of future worries, are more concerned about quantity of goods. In contrast, urbanized women are more concerned about the quality and function of goods. For example, they do not find a dryer as functional, so they do not perceive it as necessary. However, gecekondu women, although they do not know the functions of a dryer, perceive it as a necessity.

In terms of urban-oriented behavior, these gecekondu residents were found to be quite curious about and willing to learn the urban ways of living. While displaying such urban-oriented behavior, the migrant families were also preserving some characteristics of their rural background in their daily lives. They also made great use of modern house appliances as much as they could afford, and even those they could not afford. Results provide strong support for the hypothesis that there is a relationship between a woman's level of urbanization and a woman's consumption pattern and attitudes. There are also similarities among the perceptions of consumption needs and goods.

As a result, research data have shown that there are significant differences in consumer behavior among women by neighborhood. This support that consumer behavior is shaped by lifestyle. However, these differences are not absolute; there are some similarities among neighborhoods. According to this, rural-oriented behavior such as the enactment of traditional relationships that is expected from migrants is also the behavior of native-urban people. Therefore, the gecekondu districts today do not represent an economically, socially or culturally segregated rural life on the margins of the city. Nor do they characterize a transitional stage as would be assumed by modernization theories. Instead gecekondu residents have created their own lifestyle that are defined by a combination as well as a modification of traits from both rural and urban areas.

Appendix

A. Questionnaire Form^{*}

1. Birth Place:

- (1) Izmir
- (2) Towns near Izmir
- (3) Villages near Izmir
- (4) Istanbul - Ankara
- (5) Other cities
- (6) Other towns
- (7) Other villages
- (8) Abroad

2. How old are you?

- ☐ 25-34 ☐ 35-44 ☐ 45-54

3. Level of Education:

- (1) Illiterate
- (2) Literate (they can only read, but no official education)
- (3) Elementary School
- (4) Secondary School
- (5) High School
- (6) University

4. How long have you been living in Izmir?

- (1) 0-4 years
- (2) 5-9 years
- (3) 10-14 years
- (4) 15-19 years
- (5) 20 or more years

^{*} These are categories emerged in my open-ended questionnaire form.

5. Where did you live before Izmir? (Choose only one)

- (1) Towns near Izmir**
- (2) Villages near Izmir**
- (3) Istanbul - Ankara**
- (4) Other cities**
- (5) Other towns**
- (6) Other villages**
- (7) Abroad**

6. Who are you living with?

- (1) Husband only**
- (2) Husband and children**
- (3) Husband, children and parents**
- (4) Husband, children and relatives**

7. Do you have an occupation other than housewife?

- (1) No**
- (2) Yes**

8. What is your husband's job/occupation?

- (1) Government official**
- (2) Blue collar worker**
- (3) Craftsman**
- (4) Trader-Industrialist**
- (5) Tradesman**
- (6) Manager**
- (7) Other:.....**

9. What is your income per month?

10. Do you have any additional income?

- (1) No**
- (2) Yes (please specify)**

11. What social class do you consider yourself to be in?

- (1) Low
- (2) Middle-low
- (3) Middle
- (4) Upper-middle

12. Which listed products do you have?

12.1	Black & White TV	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.2	Color TV	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.3	Stove	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.4	Telephone	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.5	Vacuum Cleaner	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.6	Automatic Washer	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.7	Stereo System	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.8	VCR	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.9	Dish Washer	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.10	Food Processor	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.11	Microwave	(1) No	(2) Yes
12.12	Computer	(1) No	(2) Yes

13. Do you think that you have enough goods in your household?

- (1) Too many missing
- (2) Some missing
- (3) Enough goods

14. What is the meaning of need for you?

- (1) Goods needed to survive
- (2) Goods that I do not posses
- (3) Goods that I desire to own

15. Do you satisfied with your living standard?

- (1) Satisfactory
- (2) Less satisfactory
- (3) Unsatisfactory

16. Please specify whether or not you agree with these expressions:

- 16.1 Goods make life easier**
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Slightly Agree (3) Disagree
- 16.2 I cannot think of life without goods.**
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Slightly Agree (3) Disagree
- 16.3 Goods should be used until they wear out.**
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Slightly Agree (3) Disagree
- 16.4 Owning more than one of the same good is good in case of emergency.**
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Slightly Agree (3) Disagree
- 16.5 Instead of fixing the broken good, I had better get a new one.**
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Slightly Agree (3) Disagree
- 16.6 I prefer to update my goods when they become old-fashioned.**
(1) Strongly Agree (2) Slightly Agree (3) Disagree

17. Do you think that there is a relationship between social status and the number of acquired goods?

- (1) Exists
- (2) Not exists
- (3) No idea

18. In your opinion, what do individuals of high-social status prefer in consumer products?

- (1) Quantity
- (2) Quality
- (3) Modern
- (4) Expensive
- (5) Original

19. What characteristic of consumer goods is most important for you?

- (1) Modern
- (2) Reliable
- (3) Useful
- (4) Original
- (5) Ostentatious

20. What does quality mean to you?

- (1) Prestigious brand**
- (2) Heavily advertised**
- (3) Expensive**
- (4) Commonly purchased**
- (5) Warranty and TSE (Turkish Standard Enstitu)**
- (6) Durable**

21. Do you give importance to the brand name?

- (1) Very important**
- (2) Sometimes**
- (3) Unimportant**

22. What is your opinion about listed items? Are they necessities or luxuries?

- | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| 22.1 Automatic Washer | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |
| 22.2 Dryer | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |
| 22.3 Dish Washer | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |
| 22.4 Food Processor | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |
| 22.5 VCR | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |
| 22.6 Stereo System | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |
| 22.7 Press iron | (1)Necessity | (2)Luxury |

B. Response from Research Area

Case 1:

In the Guzeltepe resident area, a child was taking a bath in the living room in a big basin because the family did not have a bath, which is a characteristic of rural areas. It is interesting that although the household does not include bath, the housewife used the shampoo, which is considered a luxury, instead of traditional soap to clean the child. This reveals that the gecekondu resident synthesizes aspects of both rural and urban culture in the process of being urbanized. In other words, there is no parallel between the signifying space and the goods that have been used.

Case 2:

In Guzeltepe, one subject mentioned that the family could not even buy the coal for the winter. However, there is a stereo system sitting idly in the corner of the living room, which is considered a luxury in Turkey. This is very significant to show how gecekondu people structure their needs hierarchically also illustrates the conflict between their values and their actual needs.

Case 3:

In Guzeltepe, although people do not have proper facilities, such as a toilet, bathroom or kitchen, they still use modern technological products.

In Guzeltepe one subject was using a washing machine in her front yard because she did not have a bathroom. Although she did not have enough space to store her washing machine, she still used it. This shows us that consumption does not follow a rational order. Again gecekondu residents combine both rural and urban according to their living conditions.

Case 4:

Another example from Guzeltepe was during the interview subject was asked, “what is quality?” she answered “ I have never been there!” All these case studies show that gecekondu people behave randomly in terms of consumption. It sometimes can be stated that gecekondu people are influenced by their new urban environment. As a result of this, they have a hard time to visualizing their actual needs. They sometimes consume goods just because they have seen them on the television without knowing the appropriate use. Therefore, gecekondu people’s houses are filled with goods, that they sometimes do not even know how to use. However, they still have to pay large installments fees every month out of their small budgets.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Ronald J. (1977). Degree of Urbanization and its Impact on Consumer Behavior. Thesis (Ph.D.) University of Georgia.
- Ansbacher, Heinz L. (1967). Life Style: A Historical and Systematic Review. Journal of Individual Psychology. 23: 191-212
- Arnt, Johan (1978). The Quality of Life Challenge to Marketing. In: F. D. Reynolds & H.C. Barksdale (Eds.), Marketing and the Quality of Life. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Baudrillard, Jean. (1988). Selected Writings. Ed. Mark Poster California: Stanford University Press.
- Bearden, William O., Michael J. Etzel. (1982). Reference Group Influence on Product and Brand Purchase Decisions. Journal of Consumer Research. 9: 183-194
- Belk Russell, and Kenneth D. Bahn, Robert N. Mayer. Developmental Recognition of Consumption Symbolism. Journal of Consumer Research. 9: 4-17.
- Bendix, Reinhard. (1967). Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered. Comparative studies in Society and History. 9: 292-348
- Bilgin, Nuri. (1992). Esya ve İnsan. [Goods and Human Beings]. Ankara: Gundogan Press.
- Brooker, George. (1976). The Self-Actualizing Socially Conscious Consumer. Journal of Consumer Research. 3: 107-112.
- Bocock, Robert. (1993). Consumption. London; New York: Routledge. p. 53- 96
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1986). Social Space and Symbolic Power. In Choses dites. Paris: Editions de Minuit 1987: 147-166.
- Cosmas, Stephen. (1982). Life Styles and Consumption Patterns. Journal of Consumer Research. 8:453-455.

- Costello, Vincent F. (1977). Urbanization in the Middle East. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Childe, Gordon. (1981). Man Makes Himself. London: Moonraker Press.
- Danielson, Michael and Rusen Keles. (1980). Urbanization and Income Distribution in Turkey in E. Ozbudun and A. Ulsan eds. The Political Economy of Income Distribution in Turkey. New York: Holmes&Meier Publishers.
- Dikecligil, Beglu. (1980). Yasam Tarzi ve Gelir Arasindaki Iliski [The relationship between life style and income level]. Istanbul: Iktisat Fakultesi Yayini.
- Doran, K. B. (1997). Symbolic Consumption in China: The Color Television Statement. Advances in Consumer Research. 24: 128
- Douglas, Mary and Baron Isherwood. (1996). World of Goods: towards anthropology of consumption. London; New York: Routledge
- Erkut, Gulden. (1991). Kentlilesme surecinin Sosyolojik Boyutu [The Social Perspective of the Urbanization of Individuals]. Ankara: TUSES
- Erman, Tahire. (1996). Women and the Housing Environment The experiences of Turkish Migrant Women in Squatter(Gecekondü) and Apartment Housing. Environment and Behavior. 28:764-798
- _____. (1998). The Impact of Migration of Turkish Rural Women: Four Emergent Patterns. Gender and Society. 12:146-168.
- Fischer, Claude. (1995). The Subcultural Theory of Urbanism: A Twentieth-Year Assessment. The American Journal of Sociology. 101: 543-577.
- Fiske, John. (1989). Reading The Popular. Boston: Unwin Hyman, Inc.
- Fromm, Eric(1941). Escape From Freedom. Holt, Rinehart and Winston
- _____. (1968). The Revolution of Hope, Toward a Humanized Technology. New York: Harper& Row.
- Galbraith, John K. (1976). The Affluent Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

- Ger, Guliz; Belk, Russell W. (1996). Cross Cultural Differences in Materialism. Journal of Economic Psychology. 17:55-77.
- Ger, Guliz. (1992). The positive and Negative Effects of Marketing on Socioeconomic Development: The Turkish Case. Journal of Consumer Policy. 15: 229-254.
- Ginsburg, Norton. (1966). The City and Modernization. In Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth ed. Myron Weiner. London: Basic Books
- Goffman, Erving. (1951). Symbols of Class Status. The British Journal of Sociology. 2: 294-304.
- Gurbilek, Nurdan. (1992). Vitrinde Yasamak: 1980'lerin Kulturel Iklimi. [Living in the Shop-window: The Cultural Climate of Eighties]. Istanbul: Metis Press.
- Hancerlioglu, Orhan. (1986). Ekonomi sozlugu. [The Dictionary of Economy]. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Hauser, Philip, Leo F. Schnore. (1967). The Study of Urbanization. New York: John Wiley&Sons
- Holt, Douglas B. (1997). Post Culturalist Lifestyle Analysis. Journal of Consumer Research. 23:326-350
- Izmir Trade Center. (1993). Izmir Strategic Plan (1992-2007).
- Illich, Ivan. (1978). Toward a History of Needs: essays. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. (1970). Celebration of Awareness; a call for institutional revolution. New York: Doubleday.
- Irmak, Yakut. (1982). Kentlilesme: Cavit Orhan Tutengil'in Anisina Armagan. Cilt:38 Istanbul: Iktisat Fakultesi Yayini.
- Kandas, Aysegul. (1992). Tradition and Modernity Reconsidered: The Cultural Implications of Urbanization in Turkey. Thesis (Masters) University of Washington.

- Kartal, Kemal. (1983). Ekonomic ve Sosyal Yonleriyle Turkiyede Kentlesme [Socio-economic Dimensions of Urbanization in Turkey]. Ankara: Yurt Yayinlari.
- Keles, Rusen. (1978). 100 Soruda Turkiye Kentlesme, Konut ve Gecekondur [In 100 questions Urbanization, Dwelling, and Squatter in Turkey]. Istanbul: Gercek Yayınevi.
- _____. (1981). Kent Bilim Terimleri Sozlugu [Dictionary of Urban Science Terms]. Ankara: Turk Dil Kurumu Yayinlari.
- Kiray, Mubeccel. (1972). Orgutlesemeyen Kent Izmir'de Is Hayatinin Yapisi ve Yerlesme Duzeni. Ankara: Sosyal Bilimler Der.
- _____. (1979). Apartmanlasma ve Modern Orta Tabakalar [Apartmentization and Modern Middle Strata]. Ankara: Cevre.
- Kongar, Emre. (1982). Kentlesen Gecekondular ya da Gecekondulasan Kentler Sorunu, Kentsel Butunlesme [The Problem of Being Urbanized Gecekondus or Being Gecekondus Cities, and Integration to Urban Lifestyle]. Ankara: Turkiye Arastirmalari Vakfi.
- _____. (1985). Turkiyenin Toplumsal Yapisi Imparatorluktan Gunumuze cilt: 2 Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- _____. (1985). Toplumsal Degisme Kuramlari ve Turkiye Gercegi. [Theory of Social Change and Reality of Turkey]. Istanbul: Remzi Kitabevi.
- Kotler, Peter. (1997). Marketing Management. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Leigh, James H.; Gabel, Terrance G. (1992). Symbolic Interactionism: Its Effects on Consumer Behavior and Implications for Marketing Strategy. Journal of Services Marketing. 6:5-16.
- Leinwand, Gerald. (1970). The Consumer. New York: Washington Square Press
- Lloyd, Peter. (1980). The Young Towns of Lima: Aspects of Urbanization in Peru. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lowe, George D., Charles W. Peek. (1974). Location and Lifestyle: The Comparative Explanatory Ability of Urbanism and Rurality. Rural Sociology. 39: 392-411
- Macionis, John J. and Vincent N. Parrillo. (1998). Cities and Urban Life. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Mager, John. (1986). A Re-Evaluation of the Relevance of Social Status in Consumer Behavior: Is the whole more than the sum of the parts? Thesis (Ph.D.) University of Oregon.
- Maslow, Abraham. (1954). Motivation and Personality. New York: Harper and Row.
- Merton, Robert. (1968). Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: The Free Press.
- Mills, Mary B. (1997). Contesting the Margins of Modernity: women, migration, and consumption in Thailand. American Ethnologist. 24:37
- Mott, Vincent. (1972). The American Consumer: a sociological analysis. New Jersey: Florham Park Press.
- Nicosia, Francesco M., Mayer, Robert. (1976). Toward a Sociology of Consumption. The Journal of Consumer Research. 3: 65-75
- Packard, Vance. (1957). Hidden Persuaders. New York: Van Rees Press
- Page, Christine M. (1992). A History of Conspicuous Consumption. Thesis (M.S.) University of Colorado.
- Preteceille, Edmond., Jean-Pierre Terrail; translated by Sarah Matthews. (1985). Capitalism, Consumption, and Needs. Oxford; New York: Blackwell. p. 34-73.
- Saran, Nephan. (1974). Squatter(Gecekondü) Problems in Turkey, in P. Benedict, E. Tumertekin and F. Mansur eds. Turkey: Geographic and Social Perspectives. Belgium: Leiden, E.J. Brill.
- Senyapili, Tansi. (1978). Butunlesmemis Kentli Nufus Sorunu. [The Problem of Disintegrated Population of Urban Areas]. Ankara: METU

- _____. (1981). A new Component in Metropolitan Areas in N. Abadan-Unat ed. Women in Turkish Society. Belgium: Leiden E.J. Brill.
- _____. (1982). Ankara Gecekondularinin Ekonomik Profili [The Profile of Ankara's Squatters]. Ankara: Türkiye Gelisme Arastirmalari Vakfi.
- Senyapili, Onder. (1978). Kentlilesen Koyluler. Istanbul: Milliyet Yayinlari
- Schiffman, Leon G., Leslie Lazar Kanuk. (1991) Consumer Behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall. P.54
- Schopphoven, Iris. (1991). Values and Consumption Patterns: A Comparison B Rural and Urban Consumers in Western Germany. European Journal of Marketing. 25: 35
- Sheth, Jagdish N; Bruce I. Newman; Barbara L. Gross. (1991). Consumption Values and Market Choices. Cincinnati: SouthWestern Publishing CO
- Suerdem, Ahmet.(1994). Social De (Re)Construction of Mass Culture. International Journal of Research in Marketing. 11: 423-443.
- Suher, Hande. Kentlesme ve Kentlilesme Politikolari [The policies for Urbanization and Urbanization of Individuals]. Ankara: TUSES
- Tatlidil, Ercan. (1989). Kentlesme ve Gecekondulular [Urbanization and Gecekondulular]. Izmir: Ege Universitesi Edebiyat Fakultesi Yayinlari
- Tilly, Charles. (1968). The Forms of Urbanization. Knowledge and Society: American Sociology edited by Talcott Parsons. Washington, D.C.: Forum Lectures
- Timur, Serim. (1981). Determinants of Family Structure in Turkey in N. Abadan-Unat ed. Women in Turkish Society. pp.59-73.
- Valette-Florence, P. and A. Jolibert. (1990) Social Values, A.I.O., and Consumption Patterns. Journal of Business Research. 20: 109-122.
- Veblen, Thorstein. (1953). The Theory of The Leisure Class. New York: Mentor Book.

- Yesilyurt, Dilek C. (1994). Kentlilesme Surecinde Bireylerin Siyasal Deger, Tutum ve Davranislarina Aile Yapisinin Etkisi [In the Process of Urbanization The Effect of Family Structure on Political Values, Attitudes, And Behaviors]. Thesis(Ph.D.) Izmir: Ege Universitesi.**
- Williamson, Judith. (1954). Consuming Passions. London: Marion Boyars.**
- Willis, Susan. (1991). A primer For Daily Life. London: Routledge.**
- Wilkie, William. (1986). Consumer Behavior. New York: John Willey & Sons**
- Wirth, Luis. (1938). Urbanism As a Way of Life. The American Journal of Sociology. 4: 1-24**